arXiv:1608.05162v2 [math.RT] 29 Oct 2016

SEMI-STEADY NON-COMMUTATIVE CREPANT RESOLUTIONS VIA REGULAR DIMER MODELS

YUSUKE NAKAJIMA

Abstract. A consistent dimer model gives a non-commutative crepant resolution (= NCCR) of a 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity. Especially, it is known that a consistent dimer model gives a nice class of NCCRs called steady if and only if it is homotopy equivalent to a regular hexagonal dimer model. Inspired by this result, we introduce the notion of semi-steady NCCRs, and show that a consistent dimer model gives a semi-steady NCCR if and only if it is homotopy equivalent to a regular dimer model.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Basic properties of semi-steady NCCRs 4
3. NCCRs arising from dimer models 7
4. Semi-steady NCCRs arising from dimer models 12
5. Examples 18
References 19

1. Introduction

1.1. **Overview.** The notion of non-commutative crepant resolution (= NCCR) was introduced by Van den Bergh [VdB1, VdB2]. It is an algebra derived equivalent to crepant resolutions of a nice singularity, and it gives another perspective on Bondal-Orlov conjecture [BO] and Bridgeland's theorem [Bri]. NCCRs are also related with Cohen-Macaulay representation theory. Indeed, cluster tilting modules (or subcategories) give a framework to study modules giving NCCRs (see e.g., [DH, Iya, IR, IW2, IW4]), and the present paper rather stands on this viewpoint. Here, we recall the definition of NCCR [VdB2]. (For further details concerning terminologies, see later sections.)

Definition 1.1. Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay ring and let Λ be a module-finite R-algebra. We say that Λ is an *R-order* if Λ is a maximal Cohen-Macaulay R-module, and say that an R-order Λ is *non-singular* if $\operatorname{gl.dim}\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}} = \dim R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$.

We refer to [IW2, Proposition 2.17] for several conditions that are equivalent to Λ is a non-singular R-order. Using this notion, Van den Bergh [VdB2] introduced the notion of NCCR.

Definition 1.2. Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay ring, and M be a non-zero reflexive R-module. Let $E := \operatorname{End}_R(M)$. We say that E is a *non-commutative crepant resolution* (= *NCCR*) of R or M *gives an NCCR* of R if E is a non-singular R-order.

For example, an NCCR of quotient singularities is given by the skew group algebra (see e.g., [VdB2, Iya, IW2]). Furthermore, if a given quotient singularity is d-dimensional Gorenstein with $d \leq 3$, the skew group algebra is derived equivalent to crepant resolutions [BKR, KV]. Another interesting family of NCCRs is given by a dimer model. It gives us an NCCR of a 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity (see e.g., [Bro, Boc2, IU2]). Since such an NCCR is the main object in this paper, we will see the precise construction of it in Section 3. For more results and examples of NCCRs, we refer to [BLVdB, BIKR, Dao, DFI, IW1, IW2, IW3, IW4, Leu, SpVdB] and references therein.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13C14, 05B45; Secondary 14E15, 16S38.
Key words and phrases. Non-commutative crepant resolutions, Dimer models, Regular tilings, Toric singularities.

Although an NCCR does not necessarily exist for a given singularity, the existence of an NCCR shows that it has a mild singularity. That is, it was shown in [StVdB] (see also [DITV]) that under mild assumptions, any Gorenstein ring admitting an NCCR has only rational singularities. A naive idea is that if we impose extra assumptions on NCCRs, then we can obtain better singularities. Actually, O. Iyama and the author introduced the notion of steady NCCRs and splitting NCCRs in [IN], and showed that the existence of a steady splitting NCCR characterizes quotient singularities associated with finite abelian groups (see Theorem 1.5). Furthermore, by restricting this result to the case of 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularities, we also have a connection between steady splitting NCCRs and regular hexagonal dimer models (see Theorem 1.6). In this paper, after the model of steady splitting NCCRs arising from square dimer models, we will introduce another nice class of NCCRs that is weaker than steady NCCRs and call them semi-steady NCCRs. Furthermore, we will show that the existence of semi-steady NCCRs of 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularities characterizes toric singularities associated with regular dimer models (see Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 4.5).

1.2. **Semi-steady non-commutative crepant resolutions.** First, we introduce some nice classes of NCCRs. Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay ring. Since non-singular R-orders are closed under Morita equivalence (see e.g., [IW2, Lemma 2.13]), we assume that a module $M = \oplus_{i=1}^{n} M_i$ giving an NCCR is *basic*, that is, M_i's are mutually non-isomorphic. In addition, since we will discuss memberships of additive closures, we may assume that R is complete local by [IW2, Proposition 2.26]. Especially, the Krull-Schmidt condition holds in our situation.

Now, we recall the notion of steady NCCRs defined in [IN]. To define this nice class of NCCRs, we pay attention to the R-module structure of $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$. Our point is that the size of $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ as an R-module becomes much bigger than that of M, that is, $\mathrm{rank}_R \mathrm{End}_R(M) = (\mathrm{rank}_R M)^2$, hence the R-module $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ often has a direct summand that does not appear in M. Steady NCCRs exclude this possibility.

Definition 1.3. We say that a reflexive R-module M is *steady* if M is a *generator* (that is, $R \in \mathsf{add}_R M$) and $\mathrm{End}_R(M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ holds. We say that an NCCR $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ is a *steady NCCR* if M is steady.

For example, quotient singularities have a steady NCCR (see [IN, Example 2.3]).

We also introduce another class of nice NCCRs called splitting as follows, and several examples are found in [IN, Example 2.4].

Definition 1.4. We say that a reflexive R-module M is *splitting* if M is a finite direct sum of rank one reflexive modules. We say that an NCCR $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ is a *splitting NCCR* if M is splitting.

O. Iyama and the author studied these nice classes of NCCRs in [IN], and the following theorem is the starting point of this paper.

Theorem 1.5. *(see* [IN, Theorem 3.1]*) Let R be a d-dimensional complete local Cohen-Macaulay normal domain containing an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *R is a quotient singularity associated with a finite (small) abelian group $G \subset \mathrm{GL}(d,k)$ (i.e., $R = S^G$ where $S = k[[x_1, \cdots, x_d]]$).*
(2) *R has a unique basic module that gives a splitting NCCR.*
(3) *R has a steady splitting NCCR.*

A typical example of a splitting NCCR is given by a dimer model. A *dimer model* is a finite bipartite graph on the real two-torus, and we define the quiver with potential (Q, W_Q) as the dual of a dimer model. Then, we define the complete Jacobian algebra $\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$. If a dimer model satisfies the consistency condition, then the center of $\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$ is a 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity and $\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$ gives a splitting NCCR of such a singularity. Conversely, for every 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity R, there exists a consistent dimer model giving R as the center of $\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$. (For more details, see subsection 3.2, 3.3.) Therefore, we have the theorem below by restricting Theorem 1.6 to dimer models.

Theorem 1.6. *(see* [IN, Corollary 1.7]*) Let Γ be a consistent dimer model, R be the 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity associated with Γ, and k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *R is a quotient singularity associated with a finite (small) abelian group $G \subset \mathrm{SL}(3,k)$ (i.e., $R = S^G$ where $S = k[[x_1, x_2, x_3]]$). Especially, the cone defining R is simplicial.*
(2) *Γ is homotopy equivalent to a regular hexagonal dimer model (i.e., each face of a dimer model is a regular hexagon).*
(3) *Γ gives a steady NCCR of R.*

Since a dimer model is a bipartite graph on the real two-torus, the universal cover of it gives rise to the one on the Euclidean plane, hence dimer models are closely related with tilings of the Euclidean plane. A *tiling* (or *tessellation*) is a covering of the Euclidean plane using one or more polygons without overlaps and gaps. A *regular tiling* is a tiling that is made up of congruent regular polygons and edge-to-edge. Here, edge-to-edge means any two polygons intersect precisely along a common edge, or have precisely one common point which is a vertex of a polygon, or have no common points. It is well-known that regular polygons giving regular tilings are only equilateral triangles, squares, or regular hexagons as shown in Figure 1 (see e.g., [GS]).

Definition 1.7. We say that a dimer model Γ is *regular* if the underlying cell decomposition of the universal cover of Γ is homotopy equivalent to a regular tiling.



FIGURE 1. Regular tilings

Since we can not realize a regular tiling consisting of equilateral triangles as a dimer model, a dimer model is regular if and only if it is homotopy equivalent to a square dimer model or a regular hexagonal dimer model. In Theorem 1.6, we obtained a regular hexagonal dimer model as a dimer model giving a steady NCCR. Thus, inspired by Theorem 1.6, we also ask what kind of properties do NCCRs arising from square dimer models have? In this paper, we detect properties of NCCRs obtained from square dimer models. Especially, we introduce the notion of semi-steady NCCRs as we will see below. As this name shows, this notion is weaker than the steadiness. Further, we will study basic properties of semi-steady NCCRs, and as a result we show that the semi-steadiness actually characterizes NCCRs arising from square dimer models (see Theorem 1.10).

Before moving to the definition of semi-steady NCCRs, we note that if $M = \oplus_{i=0}^n M_i$ is a steady module, then it implies $\mathrm{e}_i \operatorname{End}_R(M) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ for any i, where e_i is the idempotent corresponding to the summand M_i. Semi-steadiness admits $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M)$ to be in $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$. Here, M^* denotes the R-dual of M.

Definition 1.8. Let $M = \oplus_{i=0}^n M_i$ be the indecomposable decomposition of a reflexive R-module M. We say that $M = \oplus_{i=0}^n M_i$ is *semi-steady* if M is a generator and $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$ holds for all $i = 0, \cdots, n$. In addition, we say that an NCCR $\operatorname{End}_R(M)$ is a *semi-steady NCCR* if M is semi-steady.

We note that the condition "M is a generator" can be obtained from the other condition for many cases (see Lemma 2.1). Also, we may change the later condition to $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M, M_i) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$ holds for all $i = 0, \cdots, n$ when R is a normal domain (see Lemma 2.3). Further, we can easily see that a steady module is a semi-steady module. In particular, the next lemma follows from the definition and [IN, Lemma 2.5(b)].

Lemma 1.9. *Let M be a reflexive R-module. Then, M is steady if and only if M is semi-steady and $\mathsf{add}_R M = \mathsf{add}_R M^*$ holds.*

By considering semi-steady NCCRs, we can characterize square dimer models as follows. (See Section 3 for details regarding terminologies.)

Theorem 1.10. *(see Theorem 4.2 for more precise version) Let Γ be a consistent dimer model. Suppose that R is the 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity associated with Γ. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *Γ is homotopy equivalent to a square dimer model (i.e., each face of a dimer model is a square).*
(2) *Γ is isoradial and gives a semi-steady NCCR of R that is not steady.*

When this is the case, we also see that the toric singularity R corresponding to such a dimer model is the one associated with a parallelogram.

Thus, we immediately have the following corollary by combining Theorem 1.6 and 1.10.

Corollary 1.11. *(see Corollary 4.5) With the notation as above, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *A dime model Γ is isoradial and gives a semi-steady NCCR of R.*
(2) *A dime model Γ is homotopy equivalent to a regular dimer model.*

The content of this paper is the following. First, we observe some basic properties of semi-steady modules in Section 2. The remarkable thing is that a singularity admitting a semi-steady NCCR has the typical class group (see Theorem 2.6). Since the main purpose of this paper is to investigate NCCRs arising from square dimer models, we prepare some basic results of toric singularities and dimer models in Section 3. Especially, we explain that how to construct splitting NCCRs by using consistent dimer models. After that, we prove Theorem 1.10 in Section 4. In Section 5, we give several examples of semi-steady NCCRs arising from regular dimer models.

Notations and Conventions. Throughout this paper, we will assume that k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, and a commutative noetherian ring R is complete local, thus the Krull-Schmidt condition holds (see the beginning of subsection 1.2).

In this paper, all modules are left modules, and we denote by $\mathsf{mod}R$ the category of finitely generated R-modules, by $\mathsf{add}_R M$ the full subcategory consisting of direct summands of finite direct sums of some copies of $M \in \mathsf{mod}R$. We suppose that $M = \oplus_{i=0}^{n} M_i$ always denotes the indecomposable decomposition of an R-module M. When we consider a composition of morphism, fg means we firstly apply f then g. With this convention, $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M, X)$ is an $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$-module and $\mathrm{Hom}_R(X, M)$ is an $\mathrm{End}_R(M)^{\mathrm{op}}$-module. Similarly, when we consider a quiver, a path ab means a then b.

In addition, we denote by $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ the class group of R. When we consider a divisorial ideal (rank one reflexive R-module) I as an element of $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$, we denote it by $[I]$.

2. Basic properties of semi-steady NCCRs

In this section, we present some basic properties of semi-steady modules.

We start this section with preparing some notions used in this paper. We denote the R-dual functor by $(-)^* := \mathrm{Hom}_R(-, R) : \mathsf{mod}R \to \mathsf{mod}R$. We say that $M \in \mathsf{mod}R$ is *reflexive* if the natural morphism $M \to M^{**}$ is an isomorphism. We denote by $\mathsf{ref}R$ the category of reflexive R-modules. For $M \in \mathsf{mod}R$, we define the depth of M as

$$\mathrm{depth}_R M := \inf\{i \geq 0 \mid \mathrm{Ext}^i_R(R/\mathfrak{m}, M) \neq 0\},$$

where $\mathfrak{m}$ is the maximal ideal of R. We say that M is a *maximal Cohen-Macaulay* $(= MCM)$ R-module if $\mathrm{depth}_R M = \mathrm{dim}R$. Furthermore, we say that R is a *Cohen-Macaulay ring* $(= CM\ ring)$ if R is an MCM R-module. We denote by $\mathsf{CM}R$ the category of MCM R-modules.

Before moving to basic properties of semi-steady modules, we note some comments concerning the definition of semi-steady modules.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a normal domain. Suppose that $M = \oplus_{i=0}^{n} M_i \in \mathsf{ref}R$ satisfies $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M^*$ for all i. Then, M is a generator if one of the following conditions is satisfied.*

- *R contains a field of characteristic zero,*
- *M has a rank one reflexive module as a direct summand.*

In particular, if M is splitting, then M is a generator.

Proof. First, if R contains a field of characteristic zero, we have that $R \in \mathsf{add}_R \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ by [Aus, 5.6]. Thus, we have that $R \in \mathsf{add}_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M)$ for some i, and hence $R \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$. If $R \in \mathsf{add}_R M^*$, then we have that $R = R^* \in \mathsf{add}_R M^{**} = \mathsf{add}_R M$.

Next, we suppose that I is a rank one reflexive R-module such that $I \in \mathsf{add}_R M$. Then, we have that $R \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(I, I) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$. □

The following lemma is basic, and useful to investigate semi-steady modules.

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be a normal domain. For any $M, N \in \mathsf{ref}R$, we have that*

$$\operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N)^* \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(N, M).$$

Proof. Consider a natural morphism $\varphi : M^* \otimes_R N \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N)$ $(\varphi(f \otimes y)(x) = f(x)y$ for any $x \in M, y \in N)$, and this induces

$$\varphi^* : \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N)^* \to (M^* \otimes_R N)^* \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(N, M^{**}) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(N, M).$$

We easily see that $\varphi^*_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ with $\operatorname{ht}\mathfrak{p} = 1$, and hence φ^* is also an isomorphism (see e.g., [LW, Lemma 5.11]). □

Next, we discuss the latter condition of the definition of semi-steady modules.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that R is a normal domain. For a reflexive R-module $M = \oplus_{i=0}^n M_i$, we have that $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$ holds if and only if $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M, M_i) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$ holds.*

Proof. If $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ (resp. $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$), then we have that $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M)^* \in \mathsf{add}_R M^*$ (resp. $\mathsf{add}_R M$). By Lemma 2.2, we have that $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M)^* \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, M_i) \in \mathsf{add}_R M^*$ (resp. $\mathsf{add}_R M$). By the duality, the converse also holds. □

In what follows, we show basic properties of semi-steady modules (see also [IN, Lemma 2.5]). We remark that the converse of Lemma 2.4(a) is not true (see Example 5.3).

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that R is a normal domain and $M = \oplus_{i=0}^n M_i \in \mathsf{ref}R$ is semi-steady. Then, we have the following.*

(a) *We have that $\mathsf{add}_R \operatorname{End}_R(M) = \mathsf{add}_R(M \oplus M^*)$.*
(b) *M^* is also a semi-steady R-module.*

Proof. (a) Since M is a generator, we have that $M, M^* \in \mathsf{add}_R \operatorname{End}_R(M)$. In addition, we have that $\operatorname{End}_R(M) \in \mathsf{add}_R(M \oplus M^*)$ by the definition of semi-steady module.

(b) Clearly, M^* is a generator. By Lemma 2.2, we have an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i^*, M^*) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, M_i)^{**} \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, M_i) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M)^*.$$

Therefore, $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i^*, M^*) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$ for all i. □

Further, we discuss the number of direct summands in semi-steady modules.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that R is a normal domain and $M = \oplus_{i=0}^n M_i$ is a basic semi-steady module that is not steady. We define the sets of subscripts $\mathtt{I} := \{i \mid \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \cong M\}$ and $\mathtt{I}^* := \{i \mid \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \cong M^*\}$. Then, we have the following.*

(a) *Let $\mathcal{I}$ (resp. $\mathcal{I}^*$) be the number of elements in $\mathtt{I}$ (resp. $\mathtt{I}^*$). Then, we have that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^*$.*
(b) *$n+1$ (= the number of direct summands in M) is an even number.*

Proof. (a) First, we have that $M \ncong M^*$, because M is not steady (see Lemma 1.9). Thus, there exists a direct summand $M_s \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ such that $M_s \notin \mathsf{add}_R M^*$, and hence we have that $M_s^* \in \mathsf{add}_R M^*$ and $M_s^* \notin \mathsf{add}_R M$. In the description

$$\operatorname{End}_R(M) \cong \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_0, M_0) & \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_0, M_1) & \cdots & \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_0, M_n) \\ \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_1, M_0) & \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_1, M_1) & \cdots & \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_1, M_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_n, M_0) & \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_n, M_1) & \cdots & \operatorname{Hom}_R(M_n, M_n) \end{pmatrix},$$

the number of rows appearing M_s (resp. M_s^*) is $\mathcal{I}$ (resp. $\mathcal{I}^*$). By Lemma 2.2, the number of columns appearing M_s (resp. M_s^*) is $\mathcal{I}^*$ (resp. $\mathcal{I}$). Since M is basic, we have that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^*$.

(b) Since $n + 1 = \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}^*$, this follows from (a). □

Next, we consider the class group $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$. We know that by [IN, Proposition 2.8] the class group of a CM normal domain having a steady splitting NCCR is a finite abelian group. Thus, we consider a CM normal domain having a semi-steady splitting NCCR that is not steady.

Theorem 2.6. *Let R be a CM normal domain and assume that every rank one reflexive R-module, whose class in $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ is a torsion element, is an MCM R-module (e.g., R is a toric singularity). Suppose that $M = \oplus_{i=0}^{n} M_i$ is a basic R-module giving a semi-steady splitting NCCR that is not steady. Then, $\mathrm{Cl}(R) \cong \mathbb{Z} \times A$ where A is the torsion subgroup and the order of A is equal to $\frac{n+1}{2}$. Especially, $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ contains a torsion element if and only if $n \neq 1$.*

Proof. Let $M_0 = R$. We define the set

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\, [M_0], [M_1], \cdots, [M_n] \,\}.$$

We know that $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ is generated by $[M_0], \cdots, [M_n]$ (see [IN, Proposition 2.8(a)]).

First, we assume that $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ is a finite group. For any rank one reflexive module N, we consider $\mathrm{End}_R(M \oplus N)$. Since $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ is finite, $[\mathrm{End}_R(M \oplus N)]$ is a torsion element in $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$, thus $\mathrm{End}_R(M \oplus N) \in \mathsf{CM}R$ by the assumption. By [IW2, Proposition 4.5], this implies $N \in \mathsf{add}_R M$, hence we have that $\mathrm{Cl}(R) = \mathcal{M}$. Thus, we see that M is steady by [IN, Theorem 3.1], and hence we conclude $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ is not a finite group.

Next we show that the rank of free parts of $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ is just one. Let $\mathtt{I}, \mathtt{I}^*$ be the sets as in Lemma 2.5. If $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ contains $\mathbb{Z}^2$, then we can take two elements in $\mathcal{M}$ generating $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let $[M_1], [M_2]$ be such generators (especially these are torsion-free). Since M is semi-steady, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, M) \cong M$ or M^*. If $1 \in \mathtt{I}$ holds (i.e., $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, M) \cong M$), then $-[M_1] \in \mathcal{M}$. Further, since $M \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, M))$, we also have that $-2[M_1] \in \mathcal{M}$. By repeating this argument, we have that $-t[M_1] \in \mathcal{M}$ for any integer $t \geq 1$. Since the number of elements in $\mathcal{M}$ is finite and $[M_1]$ is torsion-free, this is a contradiction, thus we have that $1 \in \mathtt{I}^*$. Similarly, we also have that $2 \in \mathtt{I}^*$. Therefore, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, M_2), \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_2, M_1) \in \mathsf{add}_R M^*$, and this also implies $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_1, M_2), \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_2, M_1) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$. By this observation, we may write $[M_2] - [M_1] = [M_s]$ for some $s \in [0, n]$. If $s \in \mathtt{I}$, then we have that

$$[\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_s, \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_2, M_1))] = [\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_2, M_1)] - [M_s] = 2[M_1] - 2[M_2] \in \mathcal{M}.$$

If $s \in \mathtt{I}^*$, then we have that

$$[\mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_2, M_1), M_s)] = [M_s] - [\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_2, M_1)] = 2[M_2] - 2[M_1] \in \mathcal{M}.$$

In any case, we have that $t[M_1] - t[M_2] \in \mathcal{M}$ for any non-zero integer t by repeating the above argument. Since $[M_1], [M_2]$ are torsion-free and generators of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, this contradicts the finiteness of $\mathcal{M}$. Therefore, we conclude $\mathrm{Cl}(R) \cong \mathbb{Z} \times A$ where A is the torsion subgroup.

Finally, we show that the order of A is equal to $\mathcal{I} = \frac{n+1}{2}$. (Recall that $\mathcal{I}$ is the number of elements in $\mathtt{I}$, and it is the same as that of elements in $\mathtt{I}^*$.) Let $[M_1]$ be a torsion-free element generating the free part of $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$. Clearly, $0 \in \mathtt{I}$ holds. Further, we see that $1 \in \mathtt{I}^*$ by the same argument as above. Next, for a subscript $i \in \mathtt{I}$, we may write $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M_j) \cong M_k$ for some $j, k \in [0, n]$. In this situation, we have the following claim:

$$\text{If } j \in \mathtt{I}^*, \text{ then we have that } k \in \mathtt{I}^*. \tag{2.1}$$

This follows from an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_k, M) &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M_j), M) \\ &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M_j), \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_j, M) \cong M^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 \in \mathtt{I}^*$, we especially have that

$$[M_1] - [M_i] = [M_k], \tag{2.2}$$

for some $i \in \mathtt{I}, k \in \mathtt{I}^*$, and easy to see that this equation induces a bijection between $\mathtt{I}$ and $\mathtt{I}^*$. (Note that $0 \in \mathtt{I}$ corresponds to $1 \in \mathtt{I}^*$.) Thus, the torsion subgroup A is generated by $[M_i]$'s with $i \in \mathtt{I}$.

Let N be a rank one reflexive module, whose class is $[N] = \sum_{i \in \mathtt{I}} t_i [M_i]$. Since $[M_i]$'s are torsion elements, we may assume $t_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For $i \in \mathtt{I}$, we see that $M \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M))$, and hence we may write $[M_1] - 2[M_i] = [M_\ell]$ for some $\ell \in [0, n]$. Furthermore, we have that $\ell \in \mathtt{I}^*$ using the claim (2.1). By repeating this argument, we have that $[M_1] - [N] = [M_m]$ with $m \in \mathtt{I}^*$. A bijection induced by (2.2) asserts that there exists $i' \in \mathtt{I}$ such that $[N] = [M_{i'}]$. Therefore, we have that $A = \{[M_i] \mid i \in \mathtt{I}\}$, especially $|A| = \mathcal{I}$. □

We give some examples of semi-steady NCCRs below. Especially, semi-steady NCCRs are well understood for the two dimensional case (see Proposition 2.9).

Example 2.7. Consider the 3-dimensional simple singularity $R = k[[x, y, u, v]]/(x^2 + y^{2n} + u^2 + v^2)$ of type A_{2n-1}. It is well known that R is of finite CM representation type (see e.g., [Yos, Chapter 12]), and finitely many MCM R-modules are R, two modules I, I^* with rank one, and $(n-1)$ modules $N_1, \cdots, N_{n-1}$ with rank two. Then, modules giving NCCRs of R are only $R \oplus I$ and $R \oplus I^*$ (see [BIKR, Proposition 2.4], [Dao, Example 3.6]). We easily see that they are semi-steady, but not steady.

Example 2.8. We consider a complete local cA_n-singularity $R = k[[x, y, u, v]]/(f - uv)$ where $f \in \mathfrak{m} = (x, y)$. Let $f = f_1 \cdots f_n$ be a decomposition of f into prime elements in $k[[x, y]]$. (Note that some elements f_i might be the same element.) We consider a subset $I \subset \{1, \cdots, n\}$, and set $f_I = \prod_{i \in I} f_i$. Further, we define the ideal $T_I \coloneqq (u, f_I) \subset R$. For each $\omega \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, we consider the maximal flag which is a sequence of subsets:

$$I_1^\omega = \{\omega(1)\} \subset I_2^\omega = \{\omega(1), \omega(2)\} \subset \cdots \subset I_{n-1}^\omega = \{\omega(1), \omega(2), \cdots, \omega(n-1)\}.$$

If $f_i \notin \mathfrak{m}^2$ for all i, then modules giving NCCRs of R are precisely $T^\omega \coloneqq R \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n-1} T_{I_j^\omega}$ where $\omega \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ (see [IW4, Theorem 5.1]) and clearly all NCCRs are splitting.

Furthermore, by using results in [IW4, Section 5], we can show the following:

(a) R has a steady NCCR if and only if $f = f_1^n$. In this case, maximal flags are only

$$\{1\} \subset \{1, 1\} \subset \cdots \subset \{\underbrace{1, 1, \cdots, 1}_{n-1}\},$$

and this gives a unique steady splitting NCCR. Further, R is isomorphic to the invariant subring under the action of the cyclic group generated by $\mathrm{diag}(1, \zeta_n, \zeta_n^{-1})$ where ζ_n is a primitive n-th root of unity, and it is the polynomial extension of a 2-dimensional A_{n-1}-singularity.

(b) R has a semi-steady NCCR that is not steady if and only if $f = f_1^a f_2^a$ where $n = 2a$. In this case, the following two maximal flags give semi-steady NCCRs that are not steady.

$$\{1\} \subset \{1, 2\} \subset \{1, 1, 2\} \subset \{1, 1, 2, 2\} \subset \cdots \subset \{\underbrace{1, 1, \cdots, 1}_{a}, \underbrace{2, 2, \cdots, 2}_{a-1}\},$$

$$\{2\} \subset \{1, 2\} \subset \{1, 2, 2\} \subset \{1, 1, 2, 2\} \subset \cdots \subset \{\underbrace{1, 1, \cdots, 1}_{a-1}, \underbrace{2, 2, \cdots, 2}_{a}\}.$$

Proposition 2.9. *Let R be a 2-dimensional complete local normal domain containing an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *R is a quotient singularity associated with a finite group $G \subset \mathrm{GL}(2, k)$ (i.e., $R = S^G$ where $S = k[[x_1, x_2]]$).*
(2) *R has a steady NCCR.*
(3) *R has a semi-steady NCCR.*
(4) *R has an NCCR.*
(5) *R is of finite CM representation type, that is, R has only finitely many non-isomorphic indecomposable MCM R-modules.*

When this is the case, modules giving NCCRs of R are additive generators of $\mathsf{CM}R$.

Proof. (2)⇒(3)⇒(4) is clear. Therefore the assertion follows from [IN, Proposition 4.2]. □

3. NCCRs arising from dimer models

In this section, we present several results concerning dimer models. Especially, we will show that a splitting non-commutative crepant resolution of a 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity is obtained from a consistent dimer model. For more results regarding dimer models, we refer to a survey article [Boc4] and references quoted in this section.

3.1. **Preliminaries on toric singularities.** We start this subsection with recalling some basic facts concerning toric singularities. For more details, see e.g., [BG, CLS].

Let $\mathsf{N} \cong \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a lattice, and $\mathsf{M} \coloneqq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathsf{N}, \mathbb{Z})$ be the dual lattice of N. Let $\mathsf{N}_{\mathbb{R}} \coloneqq \mathsf{N} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathsf{M}_{\mathbb{R}} \coloneqq \mathsf{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. We denote an inner product by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle : \mathsf{M}_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathsf{N}_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R}$. In addition, let

$$\sigma \coloneqq \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \cdots, v_n) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} v_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} v_n \subset \mathsf{N}_{\mathbb{R}}$$

be a strongly convex rational polyhedral cone generated by $v_1, \cdots, v_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Suppose that this system of generators is minimal. For each generator, we define the linear form $\lambda_i(-) \coloneqq \langle -, v_i \rangle$, and denote $\lambda(-) \coloneqq (\lambda_1(-), \cdots, \lambda_n(-))$. We consider the dual cone $\sigma^\vee$:

$$\sigma^\vee \coloneqq \{x \in \mathsf{M}_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } y \in \sigma\}.$$

Then, we consider the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic completion of a *toric singularity*

$$R \coloneqq k[[\sigma^\vee \cap \mathsf{M}]] = k[[t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_d^{a_d} \mid (a_1, \cdots, a_d) \in \sigma^\vee \cap \mathsf{M}]],$$

where $\mathfrak{m}$ is the irrelevant maximal ideal. In our setting, R is a d-dimensional CM normal domain, and it is known that R is Gorenstein if and only if there exists $x \in \sigma^\vee \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\lambda_i(x) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, n$ (see e.g., [BG, Theorem 6.33]).

For each $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define

$$\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u}) \coloneqq \{x \in \mathsf{M} \cong \mathbb{Z}^d \mid (\lambda_1(x), \cdots, \lambda_n(x)) \geq (u_1, \cdots, u_n)\}.$$

Then, we define the divisorial ideal $T(\mathbf{u})$ generated by all monomials whose exponent vector is in $\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{u})$. Clearly, we have that $T(\mathbf{u}) = T(\ulcorner \mathbf{u} \urcorner)$ where $\ulcorner \mathbf{u} \urcorner = (\ulcorner u_1 \urcorner, \cdots, \ulcorner u_n \urcorner)$, thus we will assume $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ in the rest of this paper. In general, a divisorial ideal of R takes this form. In addition, for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $T(\mathbf{u}) \cong T(\mathbf{u}')$ as an R-module if and only if there exists $y \in \mathsf{M}$ such that $u_i = u_i' + \lambda_i(y)$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, n$ (see [BG, Corollary 4.56]). Thus, we have the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}^d \xrightarrow{\lambda(-)} \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathrm{Cl}(R) \to 0,$$

especially we have the following.

Lemma 3.1. *The class group* $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathbb{Z}^n / \lambda(\mathbb{Z}^d)$*. In particular, the rank of free parts of* $\mathrm{Cl}(R)$ *is* $n - d$*.*

In this paper, we will investigate 3-dimensional Gorensitein toric singularities, thus we can take the hyperplane $z = 1$ so that generators $v_1, \cdots, v_n$ lie on this hyperplane (i.e., the third coordinate of v_i is 1). Hence, we have the lattice polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ on this plane. Conversely, for a given lattice polygon Δ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, we define the cone $\sigma_\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ whose section on the hyperplane $z = 1$ is Δ. Then, the toric singularity $R = k[[\sigma_\Delta^\vee \cap \mathbb{Z}^3]]$ associated with such a cone is Gorenstein in dimension three. In the rest of this paper, we call R obtained by the above manner the *toric singularity associated with* Δ, and call Δ the *toric diagram* of R. Note that affine transformations of Δ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ do not change the corresponding toric singularity up to isomorphism, thus we will discuss toric diagrams up to affine transformations.

3.2. **Dimer models and quivers with potentials.** A *dimer model* (or *brane tiling*) is a polygonal cell decomposition of the real two-torus $\mathsf{T} \coloneqq \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$, whose nodes and edges form a finite bipartite graph. Therefore, we color each node either black or white, and each edge connects a black node to a white node. For a dimer model Γ, we denote the set of nodes (resp. edges, faces) of Γ by Γ_0 (resp. Γ_1, Γ_2). We also obtain the bipartite graph $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ induced via the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathsf{T}$, hence we call $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ the universal cover of a dimer model Γ. For example, the left hand side of Figure 2 is a dimer model where the outer frame is the fundamental domain of the torus T, and this is a regular dimer model.

As the dual of a dimer model Γ, we define the quiver Q_Γ associated with Γ. Namely, we assign a vertex dual to each face in Γ_2, an arrow dual to each edge in Γ_1. The orientation of arrows is determined so that the white node is on the right of the arrow. For example, the right hand side of Figure 2 is the quiver obtained from the dimer model on the left. (Note that common numbers are identified in this figure.) Sometimes we simply denote the quiver Q_Γ by Q. We denote the set of vertices by Q_0 and the set of arrows by Q_1. We consider the set of oriented faces Q_F as the dual of nodes on a dimer model Γ. The orientation of faces is determined by its boundary, that is, faces dual to white (resp. black) nodes are oriented clockwise (resp. anti-clockwise). Therefore, we decompose the set of faces as $Q_F = Q_F^+ \sqcup Q_F^-$ where Q_F^+, Q_F^- denote the set of faces oriented clockwise and that of faces oriented anti-clockwise respectively.



FIGURE 2. Dimer model and the associated quiver

We define the maps $h, t : Q_1 \to Q_0$ sending an arrow $a \in Q_1$ to the head of a and the tail of a respectively. A *nontrivial path* is a finite sequence of arrows $a = a_1 \cdots a_r$ with $h(a_\ell) = t(a_{\ell+1})$ for $\ell = 1, \cdots r-1$. We define the *length of path* $a = a_1 \cdots a_r$ as $r\,(\geq 1)$, and denote by Q_r the set of paths of length r. We consider each vertex $i \in Q_0$ as a trivial path e_i of length 0 where $h(e_i) = t(e_i) = i$. We extend the maps h, t to the maps on paths, that is, $t(a) = t(a_1), h(a) = h(a_r)$ for a path $a = a_1 \cdots a_r$. We say that a path a is a *cycle* if $h(a) = t(a)$. In addition, we denote the opposite quiver of Q by Q^{op}. That is, Q^{op} is obtained from Q by reversing all arrows. Hence, we obtain the opposite quiver associated with the original dimer model by replacing white nodes by black nodes and vice versa.

For a quiver Q, the *complete path algebra* is defined as

$$\widehat{kQ} \coloneqq \prod_{r \geq 0} kQ_r$$

where kQ_r is the vector space with a basis Q_r. The multiplication is defined as $a \cdot b = ab$ (resp. $a \cdot b = 0$) if $h(a) = t(b)$ (resp. $h(a) \neq t(b)$) for paths a, b. We extend this multiplication linearly. Further, we set $\mathfrak{m}_Q \coloneqq \prod_{r \geq 1} kQ_r$. For a subset $U \subseteq \widehat{kQ}$, we define the $\mathfrak{m}_Q$*-adic closure* of U as $\overline{U} \coloneqq \bigcap_{n \geq 0}(U + \mathfrak{m}_Q^n)$.

Next, we define a potential. We denote by $[kQ, kQ]$ the k-vector space generated by all commutators in kQ and set the vector space $kQ_{\mathrm{cyc}} \coloneqq kQ/[kQ, kQ]$, thus kQ_{cyc} has a basis consists of cycles in Q. We denote by $(kQ_{\mathrm{cyc}})_r$ the subspace of kQ_{cyc} spanned by cycles of length at least r. We call an element $W \in (kQ_{\mathrm{cyc}})_2$ a *potential*, and call a pair (Q, W) a *quiver with potential* $(= QP)$.

For each face $f \in Q_F$, we associate the *small cycle* $\omega_f \in (KQ_{\mathrm{cyc}})_2$ obtained as the product of arrows around the boundary of f. For the quiver Q associated with a dimer model, we define the potential W_Q as

$$W_Q \coloneqq \sum_{f \in Q_F^+} \omega_f - \sum_{f \in Q_F^-} \omega_f.$$

For each face $f \in Q_F$, we choose an arrow $a \in \omega_f$ and consider $h(a)$ as the starting point of the small cycle ω_f. Then, we may write $e_{h(a)}\omega_f e_{h(a)} \coloneqq a_1 \cdots a_r a$ with some path $a_1 \cdots a_r$. We define the partial derivative of ω_f with respect to a by $\partial\omega_f/\partial a \coloneqq a_1 \cdots a_r$. Extending this derivative linearly, we also define $\partial W_Q/\partial a$ for any $a \in Q_1$. Then, we consider the closure of the two-sided ideal $J(W_Q) \coloneqq \overline{\langle \partial W_Q/\partial a \,|\, a \in Q_1 \rangle}$. We define the *complete Jacobian algebra* of a dimer model as

$$\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q) \coloneqq \widehat{kQ}/J(W_Q).$$

In the rest, we assume that a dimer model has no bivalent nodes which are nodes connecting only two distinct nodes. If there are bivalent nodes, we remove them as shown in [IU1, Figure 5.1], because this operation does not change the Jacobian algebra up to isomorphism.

3.3. **Consistency condition and NCCRs.** In this subsection, we impose the extra condition so-called "consistency condition" on dimer models. Under this assumption, a dimer model gives an NCCR of a 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity (see Theorem 3.9).

We need the notion of zigzag paths to introduce the consistency condition.

Definition 3.2. We say that a path on a dimer model Γ is a *zigzag path* if it makes a maximum turn to the right on a white node and a maximal turn to the left on a black node.

We also consider the lift of a zigzag path to the universal cover $\widetilde{\Gamma}$. (Note that a zigzag path on the universal cover is either periodic or infinite in both directions.) For example, zigzag paths of the dimer model given in Figure 2 are shown in Figure 3. By using this notion, we introduce the consistency condition. In the literature, there are several conditions that are equivalent to the following definition (see [Boc1, IU1]).

Definition 3.3. (see [IU1, Definition 3.5]) We say that a dimer model is *consistent* if

(1) there is no homologically trivial zigzag path,
(2) no zigzag path on the universal cover has a self-intersection,
(3) no pair of zigzag paths on the universal cover intersect each other in the same direction more than once. That is, if a pair of zigzag paths (z, w) on the universal cover has two intersections a_1, a_2 and z points from a_1 to a_2, then w point from a_2 to a_1.

Here, we remark that two zigzag paths are said to *intersect* if they share an edge (not a node).

We also introduce isoradial dimer models which are stronger than consistent ones.

Definition 3.4. ([KS, Theorem 5.1], see also [Duf, Mer]) We say that a dimer model Γ is *isoradial* (or *geometrically consistent*) if

(1) every zigzag path is a simple closed curve,
(2) any pair of zigzag paths on the universal cover share at most one edge.

By Figure 3 below, we see that the dimer model given in Figure 2 is isoradial, thus it is consistent in particular. In general, we can easily see that regular dimer models are isoradial.



FIGURE 3. Examples of zigzag paths

Next, we introduce the notion of perfect matchings. In general, every dimer model does not necessarily have a perfect matching. If a dimer model is consistent, then it has a perfect matching and every edge is contained in some perfect matchings (see e.g., [IU2, Proposition 8.1]).

Definition 3.5. A *perfect matching* (or *dimer configuration*) on a dimer model Γ is a subset P of Γ_1 such that each node is the end point of precisely one edge in P. A *perfect matching* on $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is also defined naturally via the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathsf{T}$.

For each edge contained in a perfect matching on Γ, we give the orientation from a white node to a black node. We fix a perfect matching P_0. For any perfect matching P, the difference of two perfect matchings $\mathsf{P} - \mathsf{P}_0$ forms a 1-cycle, and hence we consider such a 1-cycle as an element in the homology group $\mathrm{H}_1(\mathsf{T}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then, we obtain finitely many elements in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ corresponding to perfect matchings on Γ, and define the lattice polygon Δ as the convex hull of them. We call Δ the *perfect matching polygon* (or *characteristic polygon*) of Γ. Although this lattice polygon depends on a choice of a fixed perfect matching, it is determined up to affine transformations. We say that a perfect matching P is *extremal* if the lattice point corresponding to the 1-cycle $\mathsf{P} - \mathsf{P}_0$ lies at a vertex of Δ. If a dimer model is consistent, then there exists a unique extremal perfect matching corresponding to a vertex of Δ (see e.g., [Bro, Corollary 4.27], [IU2, Proposition 9.2]). Thus, we can give a cyclic order to extremal perfect matchings along the corresponding vertices of Δ in the anti-clockwise direction. In addition, we say that two extremal perfect matchings are *adjacent* if they are adjacent with respect to a given cyclic order. For example, $\mathsf{P}_1, \cdots, \mathsf{P}_4$ shown in Figure 4 are extremal perfect matchings on the dimer model given in Figure 2 corresponding to vertices $(1,0), (0,1), (-1,0), (0,-1)$ respectively, where P_0 is a fixed perfect matching.



FIGURE 4. Extremal perfect matchings

Then, we discuss a relationship between the perfect matching polygon and zigzag paths. Since we can consider a zigzag path z as a 1-cycle on T, it determines the homology class $[z] \in \mathrm{H}_1(\mathsf{T}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. We call this element $[z] \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ the *slope* of z. If a dimer model is consistent, a zigzag path does not have a self-intersection, and hence the slope of each zigzag path is a primitive element. Then, we have the following correspondence.

Proposition 3.6. *(see e.g.,* [IU2, Section 9],[Boc3, Corollary 2.9]*) There exists a one to one correspondence between the set of slopes of zigzag paths on a consistent dimer model and the set of primitive side segments of the perfect matching polygon. Precisely, let $v, v' \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be end points of a primitive side segment, then there exists a zigzag path whose slope coincides with $v - v'$.*

Moreover, zigzag paths having the same slope arise as the difference of two extremal perfect matchings that are adjacent.

Furthermore, by this correspondence, we can also give a cyclic order to the set of slopes of zigzag paths. Thus, we say that a pair of zigzag paths have *adjacent slopes* if their slopes are adjacent with respect to a given cyclic order. This cyclic order is essential in the definition of properly ordered dimer models written below. It is known that a dimer model is properly ordered if and only if it is consistent (see [IU1, Proposition 4.4]).

Definition 3.7. (see [Gul, Section 3.1]) We say that a dimer model is *properly ordered* if

(1) there is no homologically trivial zigzag path,
(2) no zigzag path on the universal cover has a self-intersection,
(3) no pair of zigzag paths with the same slope have a common node,
(4) for any node on the dimer model, the natural cyclic order on the set of zigzag paths touching that node coincides with the cyclic order determined by their slopes.

We can also characterize isoradial dimer models in terms of slopes of zigzag paths.

Proposition 3.8. *(see* [Bro, Propostion 3.12]*) A dimer model is isoradial if and only if the following conditions hold.*

(1) *No zigzag path on the universal cover has a self-intersection,*
(2) *Let z and z' be zigzag paths on the universal cover. If $[z], [z'] \in \mathrm{H}_1(\mathsf{T})$ are linearly independent, then they intersect in precisely one arrow.*
(3) *Let z and z' be zigzag paths on the universal cover. If $[z], [z'] \in \mathrm{H}_1(\mathsf{T})$ are linearly dependent, then they do not intersect.*

In the rest of this subsection, we present a construction of modules giving NCCRs of 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularities.

By the dual point of view, we consider a perfect matching as a function on Q_1. Namely, for each arrow $a \in Q_1$ and each perfect matching P, we define the perfect matching function:

$$\mathsf{P}(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the edge corresponding to } a \text{ is in } \mathsf{P} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Furthermore, we extend this function on the double quiver of Q. The double quiver $\widetilde{Q}$ is obtained from Q by adding the oppositely directed arrow a^* for all $a \in Q_1$. Then, we define $\mathsf{P}(a^*) = -\mathsf{P}(a)$.

Let Γ be a consistent dimer model, whose perfect matching polygon is Δ. We consider the 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity R associated with Δ. That is, the toric diagram of R is the

perfect matching polygon Δ. Let $\mathsf{P}_1, \cdots, \mathsf{P}_n$ be the extremal perfect matchings on Γ ordered cyclically. For $i, j \in Q_0$, let a_{ij} be a path from i to j (i.e., $h(a_{ij}) = j$ and $t(a_{ij}) = i$). We define the divisorial ideal of R associated with a_{ij} as

$$T_{a_{ij}} \coloneqq T(\mathsf{P}_1(a_{ij}), \cdots, \mathsf{P}_n(a_{ij})).$$

This ideal depends on only the starting point i and the ending point j, whereas a path is not unique. Namely, let a_{ij}, b_{ij} be paths from i to j, then we have that $T_{a_{ij}} \cong T_{b_{ij}}$ (see e.g., [Nak, Lemma 3.7]). Thus, we simply denote it by T_{ij}. Using this divisorial ideal, we obtain an NCCR of R as follows.

Theorem 3.9. *(see e.g.,* [Bro, IU2, Boc2]*) Suppose that (Q, W_Q) is the QP associated with a consistent dimer model Γ and $\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$ is the complete Jacobian algebra. Let $R \coloneqq \mathrm{Z}(\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q))$ be the center of $\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$. Then, R is a 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity, whose toric diagram coincides with the perfect matching polygon of Γ. Furthermore, we have that*

$$\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q) \cong \mathrm{End}_R(\bigoplus_{j \in Q_0} T_{ij}),$$

for each vertex $i \in Q_0$ and this is a splitting NCCR of R.

Remark 3.10. Here, we give a few more remarks on Theorem 3.9:

(a) Since $T^i \coloneqq \bigoplus_{j \in Q_0} T_{ij}$ contains $R \cong T_{ii}$ as a direct summand for any fixed vertex $i \in Q_0$, we have that $T_{ij} \in \mathsf{CM}R$ for any $i, j \in Q_0$. Furthermore, we see that T^i is basic (i.e., T_{ij}'s are mutually non-isomorphic).

(b) An isomorphism in Theorem 3.9 can be established by sending each arrow $j \to k$ in Q to an irreducible morphism $T_{ij} \to T_{ik}$ in $\mathrm{End}_R(T^i)$. Here, we say that a morphism $T_{ij} \to T_{ik}$ is *irreducible* in $\mathrm{End}_R(T^i)$ if it does not factor through $T_{i\ell}$ with $\ell \neq j, k$. Evidently, irreducible morphisms from T_{ij} to T_{ik} generate $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_{ij}, T_{ik})$ as an R-module.

(c) Let e_i be the idempotent corresponding to $i \in Q_0$. Then, $T^i \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(T_{ii}, \bigoplus_{j \in Q_0} T_{ij}) \cong e_i\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q)$. Furthermore, since $T_{ij}^* \cong T_{ji}$, we have that

$$\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q) \cong \mathrm{End}_R(T^i) \cong \mathrm{End}_R((T^i)^*) \cong \mathcal{P}(Q^{\mathrm{op}}, W_{Q^{\mathrm{op}}}).$$

In this manner, we obtain a 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity R and its splitting NCCR from a consistent dimer model. On the other hand, for every 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity R associated with Δ, there exists a consistent dimer model whose perfect matching polygon coincides with Δ (see [Gul, IU2]). Thus, by combining these results, we have the following corollary. We remark that a consistent dimer model giving an NCCR of R is not unique in general.

Corollary 3.11. *Every 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity admits a splitting NCCR which is constructed from a consistent dimer model.*

4. Semi-steady NCCRs arising from dimer models

In the previous section, we saw that every 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity admits NCCRs. In this section, we study splitting NCCRs arising from consistent dimer models that are semi-steady, and discuss a relationship with regular dimer models.

First, we note a basic property of semi-steady NCCRs arising from consistent dimer models.

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be a 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity. If a consistent dimer model Γ gives a semi-steady NCCR of R, then there exists a generator M such that $\mathrm{End}_R(M) \cong \mathcal{P}(Q_\Gamma, W_{Q_\Gamma})$ and $e_i\mathcal{P}(Q_\Gamma, W_{Q_\Gamma}) \cong M$ or M^* for any $i \in Q_0$. In particular, for all $i \in Q_0$, $e_i\mathcal{P}(Q_\Gamma, W_{Q_\Gamma})$ gives a semi-steady NCCR of R.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.9, we have a basic splitting MM generator M such that $\mathcal{P}(Q_\Gamma, W_{Q_\Gamma}) \cong \mathrm{End}_R(M)$, and there exists a one-to-one correspondence between direct summands in M and vertices in Q_Γ. Thus, we may write $M = \bigoplus_{i \in (Q_\Gamma)_0} M_i$. Then, for each idempotent e_i corresponding to a vertex $i \in (Q_\Gamma)_0$, we have that $e_i\mathcal{P}(Q_\Gamma, W_{Q_\Gamma}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M)$. By the definition of semi-steady module, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i, M) \in \mathsf{add}_R M$ or $\mathsf{add}_R M^*$ for any i. Since M is basic, we have the assertion by the maximality of modules giving NCCRs (see [IW2, Proposition 4.5]). The last assertion follows from Lemma 2.4(b). □

Now, we state the main theorem in this paper.

Theorem 4.2. *Let R be a 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity, $\Gamma_1, \cdots, \Gamma_n$ be consistent dimer models associated with R. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) *R is a toric singularity associated with a parallelogram (i.e., the toric diagram of R is a parallelogram).*
(2) *There exists a consistent dimer model Γ_i that is homotopy equivalent to a square dimer model.*
(3) *There exists an isoradial dimer model Γ_i giving a semi-steady NCCR of R that is not steady.*

When this is the case, an isoradial dimer model Γ gives a semi-steady NCCR of R that is not steady if and only if Γ is homotopy equivalent to a square dimer model.

Remark 4.3. Even if R is a toric singularity associated with a parallelogram, there exists a consistent dimer model that does not give a semi-steady NCCR of R (see Example 5.2). On the other hand, a consistent dimer model associated with a quotient singularity by a finite abelian group is unique (up to homotopy equivalence), and it is homotopy equivalent to a regular hexagonal dimer model, and gives a steady NCCR. (see Theorem 1.6).

Proof of Theorem 4.2. To show (1)⇒(2), we construct a consistent dimer model whose perfect matching polygon coincides with the toric diagram of R. There are several methods for constructing it (see e.g., [Gul, IU2]). To achieve our purpose, the operation in [HV] is effective. In what follows, we will construct a consistent dimer model giving the parallelogram shown in Figure 5 by using such an operation. (We can easily generalize this method for other parallelograms.)



FIGURE 5.



FIGURE 6.

Hanany-Vegh algorithm for a parallelogram [HV]**:**

(a) Consider primitive vectors orthogonal to each primitive side segments of the given polygon (see Figure 6).
(b) Consider curves on the two-torus T whose homology classes coincide with the above vectors, and write such curves on T according to the following rules:
  (b-1) They induce a cell decomposition of T.
  (b-2) Each curve intersects with other curves transversely and has a finite number of intersections.
  (b-3) No three curves intersect in the same point.
  (b-4) Tracing along each curve, we see that its intersections with other curves occur with alternating orientations. (For example, it is crossed from right to left and then left to right.)
  We call a resulting figure an *admissible position* (see Figure 7).
(c) After these processes, we have three kinds of quadrangles that are oriented clockwise, anti-clockwise and alternately:



(d) Draw white (resp. black) nodes in quadrangles oriented clockwise (resp. anti-clockwise).
(e) Connect white nodes to black ones facing each other across intersections of curves.
(f) Then, we obtain a square dimer model shown in Figure 8. We can check that this is isoradial, thus consistent in particular.



FIGURE 7.



FIGURE 8.

Note that curves in an admissible position correspond to zigzag paths of the resulting consistent dimer model with the opposite direction. Thus, the correspondence in Proposition 3.6 asserts that the given parallelogram coincides with the perfect matching polygon by rotating 90 degrees in the positive direction. Thus, we have the same lattice polygon up to affine transformations.

Using the same argument, we can obtain a dimer model that is homotopy equivalent to a square dimer model for an arbitrary parallelogram.

Next, we show (2)⇒(3). Let Γ be a dimer model associated with a given toric singularity R, and suppose that Γ is homotopy equivalent to a square dimer model. Thus, the universal cover of Γ takes the form shown in Figure 9, and Figure 10 is the list of zigzag paths on the universal cover. (They continue infinitely in both direction.) Since these zigzag paths determine four distinct slopes, the toric diagram of R is a quadrangle by Proposition 3.6. In addition, by observing these zigzag paths, we see that Γ is isoradial.



FIGURE 9. The universal cover of a square dimer model

Let (Q, W_Q) be the QP (Q, W_Q) associated with Γ. By Theorem 3.9, an MCM R-module

$$e_i\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(T_{ii}, \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{ij}) \cong \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{ij}$$

gives an NCCR of R for all $i \in Q_0$. Since we know that the toric diagram Δ of R is a quadrangle, let $u_1, \cdots, u_4 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be vertices of Δ, and we assume that these are ordered cyclically along Δ. Since Γ is consistent, there exists a unique perfect matching, which is called extremal, corresponding to each vertex. We denote extremal perfect matchings corresponding to $u_1, \cdots, u_4$ by $\mathsf{P}_1, \cdots, \mathsf{P}_4$ respectively. Here, we recall that each module T_{ij} can be constructed from the perfect matching functions of extremal ones



FIGURE 10. Zigzag paths on a square dimer model



FIGURE 11. Extremal perfect matchings of a square dimer model

(see subsection 3.3). In our situation, extremal perfect matchings $\mathsf{P}_1, \cdots, \mathsf{P}_4$ are of the form shown in Figure 11, because differences of adjacent extremal perfect matchings induce zigzag paths.

Now, we fix a vertex $k \in Q_0$, and let $M := e_k\mathcal{P}(Q, W_Q) \cong \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{kj}$. In the following, we show $\mathrm{Hom}_R(T_{ki}, M) \cong M$ or M^* for any $i \in Q_0$, and this means M is semi-steady. We divide faces of a dimer model into gray faces and white faces as shown in Figure 12, then vertices of Q are also divided into two parts. We denote by Q_0^{g} (resp. Q_0^{w}) the subset of Q_0 consisting of vertices corresponding to gray (resp. white) faces. We assume that the fixed vertex $k \in Q_0$ is in Q_0^{g}, and fix a path a_{kj} starting from $k \in Q_0^{\mathrm{g}}$ to $j \in Q_0$ for all j. (Note that module T_{kj} does not depend on a choice of a_{kj}.) By the form of extremal perfect matchings, it is easy to see that for any $\ell \in Q_0^{\mathrm{g}}$ we can find a path starting from ℓ that evaluates to the same perfect matching function as a_{kj}. Therefore, we have that $M = \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{kj} \cong \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{\ell j}$ for



FIGURE 12.



FIGURE 13.

any $\ell \in Q_0^{\mathrm{g}}$. In order to investigate a module $\bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{\ell j}$ with $\ell \in Q_0^{\mathrm{w}}$, we again consider the fixed vertex $k \in Q_0^{\mathrm{g}}$ and paths a_{kj}. Then, we shift the vertex $k \in Q_0^{\mathrm{g}}$ to the right adjacent vertex. The shifted vertex is in Q_0^{w}, and denote it by $k' \in Q_0^{\mathrm{w}}$. In addition, we denote by $b_{k'j'}$ the path shifted from a_{kj} for any j. (Figure 13 is an example of paths a_{kj} and $b_{k'j'}$.) Especially, $b_{k'j'}$'s are paths on Q^{op}, hence we have that

$$e_{k'}\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q) \cong e_{k'}\mathcal{P}(Q^{\mathrm{op}},W_{Q^{\mathrm{op}}}) \cong \bigoplus_{j'\in Q_0^{\mathrm{op}}} T(\mathsf{P}_1^{\mathrm{op}}(b_{k'j'}),\cdots,\mathsf{P}_4^{\mathrm{op}}(b_{k'j'})),$$

where $\mathsf{P}_1^{\mathrm{op}},\cdots,\mathsf{P}_4^{\mathrm{op}}$ are extremal perfect matchings on Q^{op} corresponding to vertices $u_1,\cdots,u_4$ of Δ. Thus, we have that

$$\bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{k'j} \cong e_{k'}\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q) \cong \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T(\mathsf{P}_1(a_{kj}),\cdots,\mathsf{P}_4(a_{kj}))^* \cong M^*$$

by Lemma 4.4 below. By the same argument used in the case of Q_0^{g}, we have that $M^* \cong \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{k'j} \cong \bigoplus_{j\in Q_0} T_{\ell j}$ for any $\ell \in Q_0^{\mathrm{w}}$. Consequently, we see that M is semi-steady. Furthermore, since Γ is not a regular hexagonal dimer model, this is not steady by Theorem 1.6, and hence we have the desired conclusion.

Finally, we will show (3)⇒(1). Gulotta's argument as in [Gul] asserts the existence of an isoradial dimer model associated with R. We assume that an isoradial dimer model Γ gives a semi-steady NCCR of R that is not steady. Let (Q,W_Q) be the QP associated with Γ. Then, there exists a splitting MM generator $M = \bigoplus_{i\in Q_0} M_i$ such that $\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q) \cong \mathrm{End}_R(M)$ (see Theorem 3.9), and we have that $e_i\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q) \cong M$ or M^* for any i by Lemma 4.1. We fix a vertex $i \in Q_0$ satisfying $e_i\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q) \cong M$. For any vertices $j \in Q_0$ satisfying $M \cong e_j\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q)$, we have that $e_i\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q) \cong e_j\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q)$. Here, we remark that a path in Q is a composition of arrows in Q, and it corresponds to a composition of irreducible morphisms in $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ (see Remark 3.10). Hence, the above isomorphism sends a path starting from i to a path starting from j with the same length. Especially, we see that the length of small cycles starting from i is the same as that of ones starting from j. Similarly, for any vertices $j \in Q_0$ satisfying $M \cong e_j\mathcal{P}(Q^{\mathrm{op}},W_{Q^{\mathrm{op}}})$ (namely $M^* \cong e_j\mathcal{P}(Q,W_Q)$), we also see that the length of small cycles in Q starting from i is the same as that of ones in Q^{op} starting from j. Consequently, the length of small cycles appearing in Q are all the same.

By combining Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 3.1, we see that the toric diagram of R is a quadrangle. By the correspondence in Proposition 3.6, there are four slopes of zigzag paths $[z_1],[z_2],[z_3],[z_4]$ corresponding to side segments of the toric diagram of R, especially we suppose that these are ordered cyclically with this order (e.g., Figure 14). Let m be the length of small cycles, thus for each node $v \in \Gamma_0$ there are m zigzag paths factoring through v. Since Γ is consistent, it is properly ordered. Thus, slopes of such m zigzag paths differ from each other. Therefore, m must be 3 or 4. (Note that Γ does not have bivalent nodes.) In the following, we prove that $m = 4$ and the toric diagram is a parallelogram. To show these assertions, we will use properties of isoradial dimer models listed in Proposition 3.8.



FIGURE 14.



FIGURE 15.

(The case $m = 3$) We assume that $m = 3$. Let $\mathcal{Z}_i$ be the set of zigzag paths having the same slope $[z_i]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. If the toric diagram of R is a parallelogram, then $[z_1]$ and $[z_3]$ are linearly dependent, thus there is no intersection between zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_1$ and those in $\mathcal{Z}_3$. Similarly, there is no intersection between zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_2$ and those in $\mathcal{Z}_4$. This is impossible if $m = 3$. Therefore, at least one pair of opposite sides are not parallel. We suppose that $[z_1]$ and $[z_3]$ are linearly independent, thus $z \in \mathcal{Z}_1$ intersects with $z' \in \mathcal{Z}_3$. Here, we recall that zigzag paths having the same slope arise as the difference of two extremal perfect matchings that are adjacent (see Proposition 3.6). Thus, let $\mathsf{P}_1, \mathsf{P}_2, \mathsf{P}_3, \mathsf{P}_4$ be extremal perfect matchings, and suppose that zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_i$ can be obtained as the difference $\mathsf{P}_{i+1} - \mathsf{P}_i$ where $i \in \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ (e.g., Figure 14). Let E be the set of edges on Γ consisting of intersections of zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_1$ and those in $\mathcal{Z}_3$. We consider a node that is the end point of an edge $e \in \mathsf{E}$. Since Γ is properly ordered, zigzag paths factoring through that node take the form (i) or (ii) given in Figure 15. We remark that one of (i) and (ii) does not occur in a dimer model, because $z \in \mathcal{Z}_1$ intersects with $z' \in \mathcal{Z}_3$ from left to right in (i), but the intersection occurs with the opposite orientation in (ii). We firstly consider the case (i). Since zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{Z}_3$) are obtained as the difference $\mathsf{P}_2 - \mathsf{P}_1$ (resp. $\mathsf{P}_4 - \mathsf{P}_3$), we see that $\mathsf{E} \subset \mathsf{P}_2 \cap \mathsf{P}_3$. Indeed, if there exists an edge $e \in \mathsf{P}_1 \cap \mathsf{P}_4$, then zigzag paths around e never behave as shown in Figure 15(i), because zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_4$ arise as the difference of P_1 and P_4. Let P'_2 (resp. P'_3) be the subset of edges defined by removing edges in E from the perfect matching P_2 (resp. P_3). Then, $\mathsf{P}'_3 - \mathsf{P}'_2$ forms zigzag paths in $\mathcal{Z}_2$. By this construction, we can find a node $v \in \Gamma_0$ on a zigzag path in $\mathcal{Z}_2$ such that v is the end point of both an edge in P'_2 and an edge in P'_3, and further there exists a pair of zigzag paths $(z, z') \in \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Z}_3$ sharing the common node v. Thus, zigzag paths factoring through v takes the form shown in Figure 15(ii), and this is a contradiction. We will arrive the same conclusion for the case (ii) by the same argument. Therefore, $m \neq 3$.



FIGURE 16.

(The case $m = 4$) By the definition of properly ordered dimer models, zigzag paths have the cyclic order induced by their slopes, thus they take the form given in Figure 16 on each node where $z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_i$. In particular, z_1 and z_3 do not intersect each other. Hence $[z_1]$ and $[z_3]$ are linearly dependent. Similarly, $[z_2]$ and $[z_4]$ are linearly dependent. Therefore, we see that the toric diagram is a parallelogram. □

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 4.2, we requre the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *With the notation as in the proof of Thorem 4.2* (2)⇒(3)*, we have that*

$$T(\mathsf{P}_1^{\mathrm{op}}(b_{k'j'}), \cdots, \mathsf{P}_4^{\mathrm{op}}(b_{k'j'})) \cong T(\mathsf{P}_3(b_{k'j'}), \mathsf{P}_4(b_{k'j'}), \mathsf{P}_1(b_{k'j'}), \mathsf{P}_2(b_{k'j'})) \cong T(\mathsf{P}_1(a_{kj}), \cdots, \mathsf{P}_4(a_{kj}))^*$$

for each $j \in Q_0$.

Proof. Let z be a zigzag path on Γ. By replacing white nodes with black ones and vice versa, we have Γ^{op} and the associated quiver Q^{op}. Then, $-z$ is a zigzag path on Γ^{op}. Considering slopes of zigzag paths, we see that extremal perfect matchings on Γ^{op} corresponding to vertices $u_1, \cdots, u_4$ are $\mathsf{P}_3, \mathsf{P}_4, \mathsf{P}_1, \mathsf{P}_2$ respectively by Proposition 3.6. Therefore, we obtain the first isomorphism.

Next, we consider the operation of shifting a path a_{kj} to $b_{k'j'}$. By this operation, an arrow evaluating on P_1 will shift to that on $-\mathsf{P}_3$. Similarly, an arrow evaluating on $\mathsf{P}_2, \mathsf{P}_3, \mathsf{P}_4$ will shift to that on $-\mathsf{P}_4, -\mathsf{P}_1, -\mathsf{P}_2$ respectively. Therefore, we obtain the second isomorphism. □

By combining this theorem with Theorem 1.6, we obtain a characterization of dimer models that are homotopy equivalent to regular dimer models in terms of NCCRs.

Corollary 4.5. *With the notation as Theorem 4.2, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) Γ *is isoradial and gives a semi-steady NCCR of* R.
(2) Γ *is homotopy equivalent to a regular dimer model.*

When this is the case, the toric diagram of R *is a triangle or parallelogram.*

5. Examples

We end this paper by giving several examples.

Example 5.1. (See also [IN, Corollary 1.7 and Example 1.8]) The following figures are a consistent dimer model that is homotopy equivalent to a regular hexagonal dimer model, and the associated quiver. Here, the red area denotes the fundamental domain of the two-torus. This quiver coincides with the McKay quiver of $G = \langle \mathrm{diag}(\omega, \omega^2, \omega^4) \rangle$ where ω is a primitive 7-th root of unity, and the complete Jacobian algebra is isomorphic to the skew group ring $S * G$ where $S := k[[x_1, x_2, x_3]]$. Furthermore, the center of the complete Jacobian algebra is the quotient singularity $R = S^G$. By Theorem 1.6, this dimer model gives a steady NCCR of R, which is $\mathrm{End}_R(S) \cong S * G$.



Example 5.2. Next, we consider the square dimer model given in Figure 2. For simplicity, we denote the complete Jacobian algebra associated with this dimer model by A. Then, the center of A is the 3-dimensional Gorenstein toric singularity $R = k[[\sigma^\vee \cap \mathbb{Z}^3]]$ defined by the cone σ:

$$\sigma = \mathrm{Cone}\{v_1 = (1,0,1), v_2 = (0,1,1), v_3 = (-1,0,1), v_4 = (0,-1,1)\}.$$

For this singularity, we have that $\mathrm{Cl}(R) \cong \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and hence each divisorial ideal is represented by $T(a,b,0,0)$ where $a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. By Theorem 4.2, A is a semi-steady NCCR of R (that is not steady). More precisely, we have that

$$e_i\mathsf{A} \cong R \oplus T(0,1,0,0) \oplus T(1,1,0,0) \oplus T(-1,0,0,0),$$
$$e_j\mathsf{A} \cong R \oplus T(1,0,0,0) \oplus T(1,1,0,0) \oplus T(2,1,0,0),$$

for $i = 0, 2$ and $j = 1, 3$ (see [Nak, subsection 5.2]). Further, we have that $(e_i\mathsf{A})^* \cong e_j\mathsf{A}$, and these give semi-steady NCCRs of R that are not steady. However, there exists another consistent dimer model associated with R written below, and this is not homotopy equivalent to a regular dimer model. Thus, this does not give semi-steady NCCRs. A similar example is also found in [Nak, subsection 5.11].



Example 5.3. If M is a semi-steady module, we have that $\mathsf{add}_R \operatorname{End}_R(M) = \mathsf{add}_R(M \oplus M^*)$ (see Lemma 2.4(a)), but the converse is not true as follows.

Let R be the 3-dimensional complete local Gorenstein toric singularity defined by the cone σ:

$$\sigma = \operatorname{Cone}\{v_1 = (0,1,1), v_2 = (-1,0,1), v_3 = (0,-1,1), v_4 = (1,-1,1)\}.$$

In this situation, we have that $\operatorname{Cl}(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, and each divisorial ideal is represented by $T(a,0,0,0)$ where $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the results in [Nak, subsection 5.3], we see that $M = R \oplus T(1,0,0,0) \oplus T(2,0,0,0) \oplus T(3,0,0,0)$ gives an NCCR of R. Furthermore, we have that $\mathsf{add}_R \operatorname{End}_R(M) = \mathsf{add}_R(M \oplus M^*)$, but we can check M is not semi-steady.

References

[Aus] M. Auslander, *Rational singularities and almost split sequences*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **293** (1986), no. 2, 511–531.

[Boc1] R. Bocklandt, *Consistency conditions for dimer models*, Glasgow Math. J., **54** (2012), 429–447.

[Boc2] R. Bocklandt, *Generating toric noncommutative crepant resolutions*, J. Algebra, **364** (2012), 119–147.

[Boc3] R. Bocklandt, *Toric systems and mirror symmetry*, Compos. Math. **149**, (2013), no. 11, 1839-1855.

[Boc4] R. Bocklandt, *A dimer ABC*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **48** (2016), no. 3, 387–451.

[BO] A. Bondal and D. Orlov, *Derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), 47–56, Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, (2002).

[Bri] T. Bridgeland, *Flops and derived categories*, Invent. Math. **147** (2002), no. 3, 613–632.

[BKR] T. Bridgeland, A. King and M. Reid, *The McKay correspondence as an equivalence of derived categories*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 3, 535–554.

[Bro] N. Broomhead, *Dimer model and Calabi-Yau algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., **215** no. 1011, (2012).

[BG] W. Bruns and J. Gubeladze, *Polytopes, rings and K-theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Dordrecht, (2009).

[BLVdB] R.-O. Buchweitz, G. J. Leuschke, and M. Van den Bergh, *Non-commutative desingularization of determinantal varieties I*, Invent. Math. **182** (2010), no. 1, 47–115.

[BIKR] I. Burban, O. Iyama, B. Keller, and I. Reiten, *Cluster tilting for one-dimensional hypersurface singularities*, Adv. Math. **217** (2008), no. 6, 2443–2484.

[CLS] D. A. Cox, J. B. Little, H. K. Schenck, *Toric varieties*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, volume. 124, American Mathematical Society, (2011).

[Dao] H. Dao, *Remarks on non-commutative crepant resolutions of complete intersections*, Adv. Math. **224** (2010), no. 3, 1021–1030.

[DFI] H. Dao, E. Faber and C. Ingalls, *Noncommutative (Crepant) Desingularizations and the Global Spectrum of Commutative Rings*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **18** (2015), no. 3, 633–664.

[DH] H. Dao, C. Huneke, *Vanishing of Ext, cluster tilting modules and finite global dimension of endomorphism rings*, Amer. J. Math. **135** (2013), no. 2, 561–578.

[DITV] H. Dao, O. Iyama, R. Takahashi and C. Vial, *Non-commutative resolutions and Grothendieck groups*, J. Noncommut. Geom., **9** (2015) no. 1, 21–34.

[Duf] R. J. Duffin, *Potential theory on a rhombic lattice*, J. Combinatorial Theory **5** (1968), 258–272.

[GS] B. Grünbaum and G. C. Shephard, *Tilings and patterns*, W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1987. xii+700 pp.

[Gul] D. R. Gulotta, *Properly ordered dimers, R-charges, and an efficient inverse algorithm*, J. High Energy Phys. (2008), no. 10, 014, 31.

[HV] A. Hanany and D. Vegh, *Quivers, tilings, branes and rhombi*, J. High Energy Phys. (2007), no. 10, 029, 35 pp.

[IU1] A. Ishii and K. Ueda, *A note on consistency conditions on dimer models*, Higher dimensional algebraic varieties, RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu, **B24**, Res. Inst. Math. Sci. (RIMS), Kyoto, (2011), 143–164.

[IU2] A. Ishii and K. Ueda, *Dimer models and the special McKay correspondence*, Geom. Topol. **19** (2015) 3405–3466.

[Iya] O. Iyama, *Auslander correspondence*, Adv. Math. **210** (2007), no. 1, 51–82.

[IN] O. Iyama and Y. Nakajima, *On steady non-commutative crepant resolutions*, arXiv:1509.09031.

[IR] O. Iyama and I. Reiten, *Fomin-Zelevinsky mutation and tilting modules over Calabi-Yau algebras*, Amer. J. Math. **130** (2008), no. 4, 1087–1149.

[IW1] O. Iyama, M. Wemyss, *On the Noncommutative Bondal-Orlov Conjecture*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **683** (2013), 119–128.

[IW2] O. Iyama, M. Wemyss, *Maximal modifications and Auslander-Reiten duality for non-isolated singularities*, Invent. Math. **197** (2014), no. 3, 521–586.
[IW3] O. Iyama, M. Wemyss, *Singular derived categories of $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial terminalizations and maximal modification algebras*, Adv. Math. **261** (2014), 85–121.
[IW4] O. Iyama, M. Wemyss, *Reduction of triangulated categories and maximal modification algebras for cA_n singularities*, to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.
[KV] M. Kapranov, E. Vasserot, *Kleinian singularities, derived categories and Hall algebras*, Math. Ann. 316 (2000), no. 3, 565–576.
[KS] R. Kenyon and J. M. Schlenker, *Rhombic embeddings of planar quadgraphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **357** (2005), no. 9, 3443–3458.
[Leu] G. J. Leuschke, *Non-commutative crepant resolutions: scenes from categorical geometry*, Progress in commutative algebra 1, 293–361, de Gruyter, Berlin (2012).
[LW] G. J. Leuschke and R. Wiegand, *Cohen-Macaulay Representations*, vol. 181 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society (2012).
[Mer] C. Mercat, *Discrete Riemann surfaces and the Ising model*, Comm. Math. Phys. **218** (2001), no. 1, 177–216.
[Nak] Y. Nakajima, *Mutations of splitting maximal modifying modules: The case of reflexive polygons*, arXiv:1601.05203.
[SpVdB] Š. Špenko and M. Van den Bergh, *Non-commutative resolutions of quotient singularities for reductive groups*, arXiv:1502.05240.
[StVdB] J. T. Stafford and M. Van den Bergh, *Noncommutative resolutions and rational singularities*, Special volume in honor of Melvin Hochster. Michigan Math. J. **57** (2008), 659–674.
[VdB1] M. Van den Bergh, *Three-dimensional flops and noncommutative rings*, Duke Math. J. **122** (2004), no. 3, 423-455.
[VdB2] M. Van den Bergh, *Non-Commutative Crepant Resolutions*, The Legacy of Niels Henrik Abel, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2004), 749-770.
[Yos] Y. Yoshino, *Cohen-Macaulay modules over Cohen-Macaulay rings*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, **146**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1990).

(Y. Nakajima) Graduate School Of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Furocho, Chikusaku, Nagoya, 464-8602 Japan
E-mail address: m06022z@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp